

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee**  
**July 18, 2002**  
**NWIFC Conference Center**  
**Minutes**

---

Attendees:

Bresler, Helen	DOE
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Cramer, Darin	DNR
Ehinger, Bill	DOE
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Glass, Domoni	Glass Environmental Consulting
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Lippke, Bruce	University of Washington
Liquori, Mike	Campbell Group
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McFadden, George	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Pederson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Price, David	WDFW
Quinn, Tim	WDFW
Raines, Mary	NWIFC
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

---

**Minutes:** June CMER committee minutes were approved as amended.

---

**Budget:** Copies of the current budget were distributed. There are not many changes from last month. Several new contracts have been awarded, and the Landslide Hazard Zonation project has been added. To clarify an acronym, ASC (apparent successful contractor) means that there is a successful bidder but the contract is still under negotiation and not signed. \$70,000 in project development funds from the first year of federal funding (fiscal year 2001) have not been clearly accounted for, and could not be carried over when the funding contract was closed out. This is not expected to occur in the future since a full-time Adaptive Management Program Administrator and Contracts Specialist have been hired and will track the budget better. The third year budget distributed today was approved by Policy on June 20, and will be brought to the FPB on August 7th. The 2003 fiscal year budget is \$3.415 million and includes an additional \$800,000 earmarked for the Landslide Hazard Zonation project. There is about \$64,000 unallocated. We may lose this money if we don't have a FPB-approved project to use it by early next year.

The RMZ re-sample project was approved by Policy at the full \$795,000 required for the multi-year project. Policy recommended funding for future years with the caveat that if funding becomes unsure or is cut, projects will be reprioritized.

---

### **SAG Requests:**

LWAG1: LWAG is requesting CMER approval for the Alternative Statistical approaches workshop (background materials were distributed prior to the CMER meeting) and there is a tentative outline for the agenda. The first ½ day is basic information sharing and the next 1.5 days will provide details of the two alternatives (Bayesian and information theoretical). The group is looking for examples to use at the workshop that will test both options. At this time, they are seeking CMER approval for the workshop with a budget of \$7,500 to \$10,000 to cover speaker's expenses and WFCM will handling the logistics of the workshop. it is easy for DNR to contract with WFCM directly. Participants will pay for their food and participants will have the option to order textbooks to accompany their workshop materials.

Clark suggested that LWAG ask people to read up on the two options before the workshop. Raines mentioned a website that contains good information about both options. She will send this site to CMER. Quinn said that, through discussions with a biometrician at WDFW, he has learned that there is much disagreement about the theoretical underpinnings of both methods and she suggests that, during the conference, we talk about these disagreements. There is a large split and both camps should be represented in a constructive manner. Martin suggested that we add another person to the agenda to talk about varying opinions. MacCracken said that this workshop is not designed to convince you to go one way or another, it's to provide information. Ehinger suggested that we send the two arguments out in writing rather than having the arguments orally. Raines suggested that "scale" be included in the discussion as well.

Martin reiterated that examples using CMER data would be most helpful. MacCracken agreed and LWAG is seeking help with getting the data sets. Glass said that there are a couple of models being used to look at fish and fish habitat (EDT and a USFS model). We may be able to use these models because they have already been applied. Glass will provide the websites to MacCracken. Raines suggested that we provide speakers with a list of questions that we are trying to answer as well. Martin suggested that we send them the workplan. The workshop is tentatively scheduled for October 23rd and 24th at Sawyer Hall.

**CMER Recommendation:** LWAG should proceed with the workshop; and funding will be allocated from the Project Development funds.

LWAG2: MacCracken reminded the group that during one of the meetings when we were talking about SRC review, a request was made that LWAG write-up the SRC comments on the RMZ Resample. LWAG feels that this request is inappropriate for this particular review. This review occurred before the SRC was contracted and started, so LWAG basically conducted it themselves. Martin said that the current study plan actually provides answers to most of the comments that LWAG received and resembles the document that LWAG would produce to show that reviewer comments were addressed. Raines suggested that the key point to having SAGs provide documentation that comments were addressed is to have the information available for CMER review. If there serious substantive comments from reviewers, CMER needs to be aware of that and needs to know how those comments were addressed by the SAG. After discussion, this issue was referred to the Handbook subgroup. The group will write up a proposal about how to handle the reviews and will incorporate the following concerns raised today:

- Is CMER its own peer review process if they make the final call on scientific issues raised by the SRC? Does this create a problem for CMER?
- Who should drive the process? Is it firmly in CMER's hands if you allow the SRC to respond to our response to their comments?
- Two times through the process was suggested as the limit
- If studies have fatal flaws, we need a process to be sure those are addressed before the study proceeds.
- CMER should not give the SRC power to design studies with their comments.

- The final publication process (journal) needs to be clearly separated from the study design (SRC) process.
- Will this add a significant amount of time and/or money to the SRC process?
- The small group should explore how other technical groups handle this issue.
- A notebook for each study that contains the original study design, SRC comments, SAG responses to those comments, scopes of work, etc. was suggested and has been discussed at prior CMER meetings. Electronic availability was also suggested.
- The record should address substantive comments, not editorial ones.
- The small group should speak with Dan Vogt to get his thoughts as well

**CMER Recommendation:** LWAG will provide documentation regarding their response to comments received on the RMZ resample. The handbook subgroup will work on the other issues.

---

**SRC Update:** the new contract is still unsigned but we are anticipating going with the University of Washington. We are working to lower the overhead rate.

---

**CMER Handbook Progress:** The handbook group met on 7/2, but not everyone could attend. Assignments for drafting were made and sections are being worked on. Heide and McNaughton are drafting a large portion of the handbook; Pucci and Rowton are also helping. We are on target to meet the September deadline; but the group could certainly use more help. There are likely to be some issues that need further clarification before they can be placed in a handbook. Raines suggested that we host an outside workshop to deal with these issues.

---

#### **SAG Issues:**

SAGE: the nomograph contract is signed and Domoni Glass is the contractor. The CTC contract is over budget and SAGE is working on a way to get them to respond to comments they received, though responding will put them over-budget. A report is available and Rowton will distribute a website link to the larger CMER committee to people can access the information. Comments are due by July 24<sup>th</sup> from SAGE to CTC and the report will be revised and then CMER comments will be solicited.

ISAG: The group has three contracts they are trying to get up and going and it is proving to be difficult. ISAG will also be in need of a co-chair soon as Cramer is moving to another position in DNR. Dave Price is co-chairing for the time being. There was a joint CMER/ISAG workshop meeting on Tuesday that went very well. There was CMER, Policy, ISAG and FPB representation. McNaughton said he heard the meeting was excellent and very well put together. Quinn also said that they did a great job.

BTSAG: Two RFPs have recently gone out to do bull trout overlay effective shade work. Suitable sites have not been found yet so they have delayed signing the contracts. Quinn said that it does take a long time to locate sites for manipulative studies. Glass said that we may be able to review the site descriptions and revise them slightly, which may broaden the pool of potential sites. Martin reminded the group that most of these sites will be on industry land and McFadden will be the initial interface with forest landowners. What CMER is proposing will effect whether industry lands are made available. We need to be careful about making sure that what CMER is collecting is used only for science purposes. Mobbs said that we can make no guarantee regarding future regulation based on CMER studies; we all agreed to adaptive management. Martin said that everyone in FFR understands that. Bresler added that she hopes this is not targeted at DOE temperature monitoring and reiterated that the CWA assurances are in place. Rowe said that the problem is that CMER research should not result in extra enforcement on the landowners who provide sites. Additional concerns are as follows: there are legal requirements to consider, landowners should know what will be collected and who will have the data, make sure landowners know who is coming and what their experience is (liability issue). Spend more time in the TFW cooperator meetings to talk with them about what we are doing was also recommended.

**CMER Recommendation:** The handbook group will work on guidelines for this and will bring them forward.

WETSAG: the literature review contract has been signed and progress is being made.

PIP Update: Quinn said that we have a lot of money allocated for the PIP project. Raines said that Palmquist is drafting a memo to CMER and Policy regarding adjusted time frames for this project. At this time, it looks like data will be available in September and UPSAG will be able to decide how best to present this information at that time. Quinn suggested that we may want to begin thinking about reallocating some of the \$275,000 that is currently allocated to the PIP study. Martin said that we will be revisiting the budget as we work through the workplan.

---

**Outside Information to CMER:** McNaughton said that we need to decide how we will incorporate outside information. The handbook group is working on drafting this and people who have ideas should submit them to McNaughton.

---

**Science Topic August:** continue to work on the workplan.

---

The next CMER meeting is scheduled for August 15<sup>th</sup> at the NWIFC conference center.

---

**Other Issues:** Liquori is leaving the Campbell group in about three weeks but will continue to participate in CMER for a while. At this time, Liquori no longer represents an industry group.

Issue Two: McNaughton noted that we are encouraging the environmental community to re-engage in this process and Judy Turpin would like to participate in CMER.

Agenda for next meeting: McNaughton will discuss how to manage projects with annual budgets. He will speak to how we implement projects that will take multiple years without guaranteed funding and will address ways that we can combat issues with finding study sites.

---

CMER Business Meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.